

Brent Caslin (Cal. Bar. No. 198682)  
Jenner & Block LLP  
633 West Fifth Street  
Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213 239-5100  
Facsimile: 213 239-5199  
bcaslin@jenner.com

Terrence J. Truax (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael T. Brody (*pro hac vice*)  
Gabriel A. Fuentes (*pro hac vice*)  
Jenner & Block LLP  
353 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456  
Telephone: 312 222-9350  
Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
ttruax@jenner.com  
mbrody@jenner.com  
gfuentes@jenner.com

*Attorneys for Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.,  
and Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

**Case No. 3:07-cv-5944-SC**  
**MDL No. 1917**

This Document Relates to:

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC DEFENDANTS'  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE  
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

*Best Buy Co., Inc., et al. v. Technicolor SA,  
et al., No. 13-cv-05264;*

*Electrograph Systems, Inc., et al. v.  
Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05724;*

*Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA,  
et al., No. 13-cv-05727;*

*Office Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, et al.,  
No. 13-cv-05726;*

*P.C. Richard & Son Long Island  
Corporation, et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al.,  
No. 13-cv-05725;*

*Costco Wholesale Corporation v.*

1 *Technicolor SA, et al.*, No. 13-cv-05723;  
 2 *Schultze Agency Services, LLC v.*  
 3 *Technicolor SA, Ltd., et al.*, No. 13-cv-  
 05668;

4 *Sears, Roebuck and Co., et al. v.*  
 5 *Technicolor SA*, No. 13-cv-05262;

6 *Tech Data Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et*  
 7 *al.*, No.13-cv-00157;

8 *Siegel v. Technicolor SA, et al.*, No.13-cv-  
 05261.

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
 10 Defendants Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric U.S., Inc., and  
 11 Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.’s (collectively, the “Mitsubishi Electric  
 12 Defendants”) administrative motion to file the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants’ Reply in Support  
 13 of Its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to Direct Action Purchasers’ Sherman Act  
 14 Damages Claims Based on CRT Product Purchases from NEC Corporation and NEC-Mitsubishi  
 15 Electric Visual Systems Corporation (the “Reply”), Under Seal, has come before the Court.  
 16 Having considered the Reply and the portions proposed to be filed under seal, pursuant to the  
 17 Court’s prior sealing orders, and for good cause shown,

18  
 19 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the following are to be sealed:

- 20 • The redacted portions on pages 1, 3, 10, and 11, which reference  
 21 “Confidential” or “Highly Confidential” information.

22  
 23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Honorable Samuel Conti  
 United States District Judge